Remarks

This amendment responds to the official action of January 20, 2011 and is accompanied by a one month extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a).

Claims 15 and 16 have been allowed. Claim 14 was considered allowable if placed in independent form including the subject matter of its base claim 1. (There is no intervening dependent claim.) Applicant has now copied claim 14 into claim 1 in order to comply with the indication of allowable subject matter. Claim 14 has been canceled.

In the official action, objection was made to claim 1 for alleged lack of antecedent basis in the specification for the part of claim 1 that reads: "a pair of jaws gripping an outer perimeter of the housing of the shower head between two diametrically opposed locations at a widest part of the housing of the shower head, the holder acting by means of an interference fit with the housing and permitting withdrawal and introduction of the shower head between the jaws, along a direction of the grip."

Applicant has amended claim 1 to overcome this objection. The amended claim recites as before that the holder engages on the housing of the shower head by a pair of jaws gripping an outer perimeter of the housing of the shower head, which has antecedent basis at least at page 2, lines 25-26 ("the holder may be configured such that it grips the outer perimeter of the shower head's housing . . .") and page 5, line 22-23 ("pair of jaws whose inner surfaces are contoured to match the outer surfaces of the shower head's housing . . .").

The foregoing claim limitations, and also additional phrases contained in the passage quoted in the official action, are supported by the specification as filed, particularly from page 5, line 20 to page 6, line 22. But in the specification, the limitations are found in different sentences or are inherent in the description, rather than appearing verbatim as the same recital at claim 1, lines 10-13 above (now canceled). This appears to be the basis for objection to "diametrically opposed locations" (but see page 3, line 8 and/or page 6, lines 8-9); "interference fit" (see page 5, line 27); "widest

part" (inherent in diametrically opposite points); and "along a direction of the grip" (described as normal to the drawing sheet or as toward the wall at page 5, line 27, page 6, lines 21-22, which is along the direction of the grip as shown).

Limitations to which the examiner objects in claim 1, which are not necessary to distinguish over the prior art, have been canceled from claim 1 as amended, in order to overcome the objection to the specification. As stated in the official action at numbered paragraph 4, US 4,091,998 – Peterson was considered to disclose a holder 10 that acts by means of an *interference fit*, allows withdrawal and introduction along a direction of the grip, and engages at two diametrically opposed locations located at the widest part of the housing. Therefore, these particular phrases were not relied upon in the indication of allowable subject matter. The objection to the specification is obviated by applicant removing from claim 1 the phrases to which the examiner objects; and claim 1, as amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 14, patentably distinguishes over the prior art. The differences between the claim 1 as amended and the prior art are such that the subject matter claimed as a whole is novel and unobvious.

Applicant is pleased to note the allowance of claims 15, 16 and the indication of allowable subject matter as to claim 14, now incorporated into base claim 1 as amended. All objections and all grounds of rejection have been overcome. Claims 1, 7-9, 11, 15 and 16 are allowable in accordance with the official action. No new matter is presented.

Applicant requests formal allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted.

Date: May 12, 2011 /Stephan Gribok/

Stephan P. Gribok, Reg. No. 29,643 Duane Morris LLP 30 South 17th Street Philadelphia, PA 19103-4196

Docket No. D4700-00425 tel. 215-979-1283 P 43743 WO/US fax. 215-689-2443

SPGRIBOK@DUANEMORRIS.COM